UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,370	04/22/2004	Houman Pournasseh	5486-0210PUS1	7092

67321   7590   07/17/2009
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
PO Box 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
VO, TED T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 March 2009*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-12 and 14-24* is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-12 and 14-24* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the communication filed on 03/26/2009.

Claims 1, 3-12, 14-24 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

2.   This is in response to the arguments filed in the remarks filed on 03/26/2009.

With regards to the arguments to the claimed rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103,

Applicants submitted that amending Claim 1 (and claims 12 and 23) is not anticipated by

Trolltech AS. Applicants submitted Trolltech does not teach a feature where a user may

selectively choose a particular translation table for modifying a particular application.

Applicants added in the submission that Trolltech, in combination with Python, fails to teach the

dependent claims, addressed in the prior office action.

Examiner's response: The entire Applicants' arguments are generic that fail to address

any patentable feature of the claims. In the claims and in one of the arguments, Applicants

asserted to "a user"; it should be noted that a claim that is limited based on the act of a user fail

to address infringement. On the other hand, the Trolltech shows a translation table: See p. 10 sec.

4, in statement, "an extra feature of the translate function is that if no translation table is

installed, it will simply returns its argument", it simply tells to the reader that it requires a

translation table in its tool, and the Trolltech is about to provide it. Also see in Trolltech (p. 10-

11)

> Qt also provides tools to assist application developers building and maintain translation tables.
> One tool, `findtr()`, searches the application source code for strings that need translation and
> produces a formatted text file with empty areas where the application translators will simply fill in
> the required translations. Another tool, `msg2qm()`, converts these text files to the binary, hashed
> translation table files that are used by Qt for lookup at run-time. A third tool, `mergetr()`, helps
> to merge existing translation files when the application has been extended or modified so that new
> strings that need translation have been added.

Clearly, the tool in the Trolltech provides the accessibility to the translation table, and translation

files, where within the table and files in the tool, it has the capability of being extended and

modified.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign
> country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of
> application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1, 3, 8, 10-11, 12, 14, 19, 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Trolltech AS, "Qt/Embedded – A Technical Overview", 2001, Trolltech.

As per Claim 1: Trolltech AS discloses,

*A process for modifying information from a source language
to a target language comprising the steps of:*

*providing **an interface**, supported by a computing device, to a user to modify **how data to
be translated** is addressed* (See Internationalization, p. 9-11, provided with API functions for localizing an application)

*selecting **a source language** and **a target language** based upon the modified translation by
the user* (e.g. based on locale setting, p. 10, English/Japanese, p. 11);

<u>*selecting a translation table, by the user, based on at least one application-specific
constraint, with the user-selected translation table bypassing comparison through a core
translation table;*</u>

(Since this limitation recites a user intervention, it is improper for having a weight, therefore, any term that relates to tool will meet the recitation: See the tool shown in p. 10, that is associated with the translation table and translated files)

intercepting data** destined for one of **a system resource** or **Graphic Data Interface
(parameters/arguments (*intercepting data*) specified in the input of the translator, tool functions (i.e. findst(),
msg2qm(), etc and GDI in Figure 1 (*a system resource or Graphic Data Interface*)) run in the translation process);

***comparing** said **intercepting data** (parameters/argument) against data in <u>the user-selected
translation table</u> to determine **if a match exists** between the data being intercepted and the data
in the <u>user-selected</u> translation table for the source language*

(See section localization, p. 10-11, e.g. running the tr(), by taking the given argument against the translation table.
For example, at run-time, the translation does a lookup (i.e. *determine if a match exists between the data being
intercepted and the data in the core translation table*) in the current translation table and return the text string
(translation) corresponding (i.e. *if a match exists*) to the argument); *and*

***replacing and intercepting data** with said data from said <u>user-selected</u> translation table based
when **a match is found** based on said comparing step* (See section localization, p. 10-11, lookup in
translation table, and third tool that uses mergetr(), and the examples that provide the translation into Japanese in p.
11), *and when **no match is found** based on said comparing step the data is **redirected to a
resource loader** for the process for modifying information or the Graphic Data Interface for
normal processing and displaying the information upon a display device* (See p. 10: the "return text
string", i.e. it simply returns the same argument, and the Qt in the goad to extend latter versions) .

<u>As per Claim 3</u>: Trolltech AS discloses, *The process according to claim 1, further comprising
the steps of: comparing said intercepted data against data in an application translation table;
and replacing said intercepted data with said data from said application translation table.*
Inherent in the translation; i.e. when provided with "tr (arguments)", the translation uses
findtr(…), and do the lookup, examples in p. 11)

<u>As per Claim 8</u>: Trolltech AS discloses, *The process according to claim 1, further comprising
the steps of."*

restoring translated data into a format of said intercepted data (Refer to msg2qm (), it does the binary translation; i.e. from a binary data that presents in English data into a binary that present in Japanese data).

As per Claim 10: Trolltech disclose, *The process according to claim 1, further comprising the steps of:*
comparing said intercepted data against data in a community-built translation table; and
replacing said intercepted data against data from said community-built translation table.

See tr() and see rationale in claim 3.

As per Claim 11: Trolltech AS discloses, *The process according to claim 1, further comprising the step of: processing said intercepted data using machine translation.* See tr().

As per Claims 12, 14, 19, 21-22: See rationale addressed in the rejection of claims 1, 3, 8, and 10-11 above.

As per Claims 23-24: See rationale addressed in the rejection of claims 1, 8 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
> matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole
> would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived
> by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 4-7, 9, 15-18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Trolltech AS, "Qt/Embedded – A Technical Overview", 2001, in view of Python,

"Python Library Reference", October 2000, BeOpen.com PythonLabs.

Trolltech does not discuss a simplification and normalization in a translation for localization of

an intercepted data, characterized in:

As per Claim 4: In view of Trolltech, Python discloses, *The process according to claim 1, further comprising the step of:*
simplifying and normalizing said intercepted data. (Inherent in translating as discussed in the
reference, using third tool, because the recited limitation does not present any functionality).

> As per Claim 5: Trolltech AS discloses, *The process according to claim 4, wherein said simplifying and normalizing step further comprising the step of:*
>
> *unifying a case of said intercepted data* (such as using lower() and upper () seen in p. 63).
>
> As per Claim 6: Trolltech AS discloses, *The process according to claim 4, wherein said simplifying and normalizing step further comprising the step of:*
>
> *removing control characters* (such as using translate () seen in p. 63).
>
> As per Claim 7: Trolltech AS discloses, *The process according to claim 4, wherein said simplifying*
> *and normalizing step further comprising the step of:*
>
> *cross referencing said intercepted data between resource loader and Graphic Data Interface* (such as using matching vs searching seen in p. 67).

However, many prior arts' suggestions show programming syntax and language culture

are involved in localization. For example, it is known that C++ syntax is case sensitive, i.e. it

distinguishes between c and C. Many other languages in the world do not have the same

alphabet systems, therefore the string implementation cannot be felt into the set of the control

characters used under the standard English keyboard . Many other languages in the world can not

be one-on-one mapping because of language culture. Therefore, it must require simplification

and normalization as usual for language localization, i.e. it is only a natural requirement.

Python provides resource loaders (see chapter 2, start p. 3) which are used to normalize

and simplify intercepted data in localization as discussed in sec. 6.23.3, start p. 158.

Therefore, it is obvious for an ordinary in the art to add certain resource loaders in

Trolltech like loaders in Python, as characterized in Claims 4-7 in the locale translation for the

purpose of simplification and normalization for conforming to the language cultures and

differences as defined by L10N.

As per Claim 9: Trolltech does not explicitly disclose *resizing a displayed item*, characterized in,
The process according to claim 1, further comprising the step of."
resizing a displayed item to show said translated data

Python provides resource loader "resize", and other functions that involved in translation,

thus it is obvious to the ordinary in the art to utilize certain string operation would render

characters for conforming to the language cultures and differences as defined by L10N.

As per Claims 15-18, 20: See rationale addressed in the rejection of claims 4-7, and 9 above.

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3706. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM to 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708.

The facsimile number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is the Central Facsimile number 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TTV
July 8, 2009

/Ted T. Vo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2191